

EXHIBIT A

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
3 RICHMOND DIVISION

4

5

6 ePLUS, INC. : Civil Action No.
7 vs. : 3:09CV620
8 LAWSON SOFTWARE, INC. : July 28, 2010
9

10

11 COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF THE MOTIONS HEARING

12 BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. PAYNE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

14

APPEARANCES:

15

16 Scott L. Robertson, Esquire
16 Michael G. Strapp, Esquire
16 Jennifer A. Albert, Esquire
17 Goodwin Procter, LLP
17 901 New York Avenue NW
18 Suite 900
18 Washington, D.C. 20001

19

23

24

Official Court Reporter
United States District Court

1 APPEARANCES: (cont'g)

2 Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire
3 Troutman Sanders, LLP
3 1001 Haxall Point
Richmond, Virginia 23219
4
5 Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire
Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire
6 Merchant & Gould, PC
80 South Eighth Street
Suite 3200
7 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Counsel for the defendant
8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 rule was, and they divided their expert reports up. We
2 objected --

3 THE COURT: I know that. I got that. What we have
4 here is what does that word in the order mean, I suppose, and
5 how the parties have dealt with the issues surrounding it and
6 what's the consequence to them and to you of granting the
7 relief or denying it respectively. That's what I'm trying to
8 sort out.

9 MS. STOLL-DeBELL: So, I think, you know, he's
10 already said he may not call Mr. Niemeyer. So I assume if you
11 order them to choose one expert for infringement and one for
12 validity, I assume they'll choose Dr. Weaver for infringement,
13 and they'll put him on the stand and he'll give the opinion he
14 disclosed in his report. As for validity, they are going --

15 THE COURT: Did Hilliard give validity opinions that
16 are at issue in the case?

17 MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Pardon me?

18 THE COURT: Did he give validity opinions on the
19 issues in the case?

20 MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Mr. Hilliard?

21 THE COURT: Yes.

22 MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Yeah, he did on Sections 102 and
23 103.

24 THE COURT: Would you look at 21, his slide 21. He
25 says, if Weaver can't testify on invalidity, he doesn't have

1 anybody on 101 -- 112, description, enablement, and
2 indefiniteness, because Hilliard didn't opine on those issues.
3 Is that a correct assertion, in your view?

4 MS. STOLL-DeBELL: Yes, I think it is.

5 THE COURT: So in essence what you are asking me to
6 do is to grant judgment for you because they had their foot off
7 base, i.e., they're going to be at the point where they don't
8 have any testimony, and a Rule 50 motion would have to be
9 granted at the end of the case, and we'd be going through all
10 this for nothing insofar as they're concerned, and so I think I
11 understand. Is there anything else that you've got to argue?

12 MS. STOLL-DeBELL: No, I don't think so.

13 THE COURT: You've made quite a good argument, and
14 it's a forceful one and a right one, but in many respects, I
15 think the Court has got to be mindful of the fact that perhaps
16 it played a role in this situation as well, and when that
17 happens, the Court has to be somewhat more understanding than
18 when the parties are on their own, do something that is
19 prohibited by an order. So that's kind of what's on my mind,
20 and if you want to address any of that, you can.

21 MS. STOLL-DeBELL: I just think Lawson didn't do
22 anything wrong here for this particular issue.

23 THE COURT: You didn't, and I don't think he's argued
24 for one minute that you did anything wrong with respect to what
25 you designated and how you interpreted things. He did say you